THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

W.P.No.21015 of 2005

Date:26.09.2005

G.Sajjan

--------PETITIONER

The Depot Manager and others

---------RESPONDENTS

ORDER:

The petitioner was employed as a Trimmer in Narasampet Depot of A.P.S.R.T.C. He was placed under suspension through order, dated 19.09.2005, on the ground that he accompanied an Ex-Member of Parliament to the Office of the 2nd respondent. It was alleged that the Ex-Member of Parliament along with his followers, including the petitioner, had created an ugly scene and used filthy and abusive language against the 2nd respondent. The petitioner challenges the order of suspension.

Sri Pankaj Reddy, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the presence of the petitioner was referred to in F.I.R., no acts of indiscipline were alleged against him, in it. He contends that the petitioner, being the Union Leader of SC, ST Employees in the A.P.S.R.T.C., in Warangal, submitted a representation to the concerned authorities and that he did not resort to any acts of misconduct. He submits that the impugned order was passed as a vindictive measure, to cover up the use of objectionable language by the 2nd respondent, against an employee.

Smt Rajani Reddy, the learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, submits that the petitioner was placed under suspension, after conducting preliminary enquiry and that the truth or otherwise of the allegations made

against the petitioner would come to light, only after the enquiry is concluded. She contends that no interference is called for, with the impugned order.

The scope of interference with an order of suspension pending enquiry, into the acts of indiscipline, is very limited. In the impugned order, it was alleged that the petitioner had accompanied an Ex-Member of Parliament, to the Office of the 2nd respondent and that the latter was abused in a filthy language. It is not as if the petitioner was placed under suspension, on any hearsay. On receiving the information about the said incident, the 1st respondent caused preliminary enquiry and based on the same, he passed the impugned order. This Court does not find any basis to interfere with the same. The interest of the petitioner can be protected by directing the 1st respondent to conclude the enquiry at the earliest possible time.

Hence, the writ petition is disposed of, directing that the 1st respondent shall conclude the enquiry initiated against the petitioner, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

26.09.2005

Jsu